

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

NAVSUP FLC Jacksonville, Florida is currently evaluating competitive offers for Air Terminal and Ground Handling Services (ATGHS) operational and logistical support for the U.S. Naval forces, Joint services and tenant commands located at the U.S. Naval Station at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Operational and logistical support shall consist of all managerial, supervisory, administrative and technical support; equipment, tools, materials and other items and services, (except as specified within the contract as Government-furnished materials, equipment, facilities, services, and training) and other personnel necessary to accomplish Air Traffic Control Operations, Air Terminal Services, Transient Line Services, Ground Support Equipment Maintenance and Ground Electronics Maintenance Services at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

You have been named as a point of contact for services previously provided by the contractor cited herein. Please provide the information requested in the questionnaire. The information you provide will become part of the source selection documentation, however your name will not be released to any of the parties. Should you have any questions concerning this request, please contact Ms. LaShawn Brown via E-mail at lashawn.brown@navy.mil.

(To be completed by NAVSUP FLC)

Contractor:

Address:

=====

(To be completed by person to whom questionnaire is addressed):

1. Background Information

- a. Name of person completing this questionnaire and position.

Name: _____
Tel No. _____
E-mail Address: _____
E-mail Address: _____

- b. Contract No: _____

- c. Description of service: _____

- d. Period of Performance (all years): _____

- e. Total value of the contract (all years): _____

2. Contractor's Past Performance

- a. In your opinion, is the work performed under your contract is similar in scope, size and complexity as the work described below:

Please circle one of the four levels of relevancy:

RATING				
VR	R	SR	NR	Scope
VR	R	SR	NR	Magnitude
VR	R	SR	NR	Complexity

VR= Very Relevant

R = Relevant

SR= Somewhat Relevant

NR= Not Relevant

Scope: Range of operations covered

Magnitude: Dollar value

Complexity: Degree of difficulty

Comments: _____

The definitions for relevancy ratings are as follows:

Very Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope, magnitude of efforts, and complexities this solicitation requires.

Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope, magnitude of efforts, and complexities this solicitation requires.

Somewhat Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope, magnitude of efforts, and complexities this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope, magnitude of efforts, and complexities this solicitation requires.

- b. Please circle a rating in answer to each of the following questions and provide comments as appropriate.

1. How would you rate the **quality** of services received?

Substantial
Confidence

Satisfactory
Confidence

Limited
Confidence

No Confidence

Unknown
Confidence

Comments: _____

Source Selection Information see FAR 3.104

The definitions for confidence ratings are as follows:

Substantial Confidence Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Satisfactory Confidence Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Limited Confidence Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

No Confidence Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

Unknown Confidence No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

2. How would you rate the **timeliness** of the services received?

Substantial Confidence	Satisfactory Confidence	Limited Confidence	No Confidence	Unknown Confidence
---------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	---------------	-----------------------

Comments: _____

3. How would you rate **customer satisfaction**?

Substantial Confidence	Satisfactory Confidence	Limited Confidence	No Confidence	Unknown Confidence
---------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	---------------	-----------------------

Comments: _____

4. To what extent did the **contractor's performance conform to the terms and conditions** of the contract/employment?

Substantial Confidence	Satisfactory Confidence	Limited Confidence	No Confidence	Unknown Confidence
---------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	---------------	-----------------------

Comments: _____

5. To what extent was the contractor **reasonable and cooperative** during performance (including cooperating with successor contractor)?

Substantial
Confidence

Satisfactory
Confidence

Limited
Confidence

No Confidence

Unknown
Confidence

Comments: _____

c. Other comments: _____

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Cont'd)

OVERALL RATING

☐ **SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE:** Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

☐ **SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE:** Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

☐ **LIMITED CONFIDENCE:** Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

☐ **NO CONFIDENCE:** No Confidence Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

☐ **UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE:** No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

